Appl. No. 09/839,037
Amdt. Dated October 20, 2004
Reply to Office Action of August 24, 2004

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Office action mailed August 24, 2004. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 14-23 remain pending in the application, with Claim 14 being the independent claim. No claims have been amended herein, and no new matter is believed to have been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 14-16, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Nos. 5,886,634 (Muhme) and 6,493,724 (Cusack et al.), Claims 17, 19, 20, 22, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Muhme, Cusack et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,487,479 (Nelson), and Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Muhme, Cusack et al., Nelson, and U.S. Patent No. 6,220,509 (Byford). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 14 relates to a data processing system adapted to manage the transfer of parts stored in a secure area by a supplier to a customer via a computer network. The data processing system includes a storefront database having secure area inventory information stored therein, a processor in operable communication with the storefront database, and configured to selectively communicate with a customer client and a supplier client via the computer network, and memory coupled to the processor. The memory has program instructions stored therein that the processor executes. Included among these program instructions are: (1) receiving secure area part reception and issuing information from the customer client via the computer network, and (2) updating the secure area inventory information in the storefront database using, as appropriate, the reception and issuing information.

Muhme relates to a system and method for authorizing removal of one or more items from a facility. The system includes a plurality of RFID tags (20, 22), one or more

RFID readers (100, 102, included in Base Station 108), an inventory database (38) in an inventory control system (36), and an interface (40) that allows entry and modification of data stored in the database (38) and to retrieve ingress and egress information therefrom. The RFID tags are associated with an item and a person. The RFID reader reads the RFID tags, and then consults the inventory database (38), via an inventory interface (124), to determine if a proper association exists between the tagged item(s) and the person. If a proper association exists, then item removal is allowed and the inventory interface (124) communicates ingress and egress information to the inventory control system (36) and the inventory database (38) with new location and status information.

The Office action alleges that the interface (40) of Muhme corresponds to the claimed processor, that wireless interface (102) corresponds to the computer network, and further alleges that the disclosed interface (40) executes the claimed program instructions. This is clearly erroneous since nowhere does Muhme disclose, or even remotely suggest, that the interface (40) executes instructions that include receiving secure area part reception or issuing information from a customer client, nor that the interface (40) updates the inventory database (38) using such information. Rather, as noted above, it is the inventory interface (124) within the base station (108) that updates the inventory database (38) with ingress and egress information. Furthermore, even assuming, *arguendo*, that in the alternative the base station (108) corresponds to the claimed processor, neither the base station (108) nor any portion thereof receives secure area part reception information from a customer client via a computer network, as is recited in independent Claim 14.

In addition to the above deficiency, Applicant submits that Muhme fails to disclose, or even remotely suggest, that any portion of the disclosed system (10), including neither the interface (40) nor the base station (108), is configured to selectively communicate with a customer client *and* a supplier client via the computer network. Nonetheless, the Office action cites Cusack et al., and alleges that its teaching makes up for this deficiency.

Cusack et al. relates to a system and method for managing and distributing an inventory of perishable samples, such as biological samples, and includes a host site (12) in communication with a database (14), via a search engine (13). A sample provider (16) and a sample buyer (18) can access the host site (12) via a distributed communication network, and may initiate searches of the database (14).

While not conceding the propriety of combining Muhme and Cusack et al., nor the analysis proffered in the Office action, Applicant submits that Cusack et al. at least fails to disclose, or even remotely suggest, the previously noted deficiency of Muhme. Namely, it is submitted that neither of these references teaches or suggests a processor that executes instructions that include receiving secure area part reception or issuing information from a customer client, and updating a storefront database using such information, as is recited in independent Claim 14.

As regards the remaining references that were applied in the Office action, Nelson relates to a system and method for accessing aircraft-related component repair orders, and Byford relates to a system for tracing parcels. Both of these patents have been reviewed, and Applicant submits that neither makes up for at least the above-noted deficiency of Muhme, either alone or in combination with Cusack et al., with respect to independent Claim 14. Namely, neither of these citations discloses a processor in operable communication with the storefront database, and configured to selectively communicate with a customer client and a supplier client via the computer network, and that executes instructions that include receiving secure area part reception or issuing information from a customer client, and updating a storefront database using such information.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is requested.

Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claim 14 is patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claim and because each recite features which are

patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: October 20 2004

By: _____
Paul D. Amrozowicz
Reg. No. 45,264
(480) 385-5060